

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are pending. Claims 1-42 stand rejected. Claims 9-18 and 30-39 are canceled. Claims 1 and 22 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

Rejection Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10-18, 21-23, 28, 31-39, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,706,286 (Reiman et al). Claims 1 and 22 have been amended. Reiman does not anticipate the claims for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an interworking unit configured to convert communications for a call between a first communication format and a second communication format in response to a control message and a signaling processor configured to generate and transfer the control message. Reiman does not disclose an interworking unit configured as required by claim 1 nor a signaling processor configured as required by claim 1.

The Office Action (April 1, 2003) cites reference number 14 of Fig. 1 as the interworking unit of Reiman. However, intelligent service network node 14 does not convert call communications. Rather, ISN node 14 only converts call signaling. Specifically, gateways 18 receive queries from the PSTN and reformat the queries into a format the ISN nodes 14 can process, but the gateways do not convert call communications (Reiman, col. 17, lines 25-30). Network switch 4 could convert call communications, but Reiman does not disclose network switch 4 converting the call communications in response to a control message from a signaling processor.


Dependent claims 2, 7, 21, 23, 28, and 42 each recite further limitations that render these claims separately patentable over the prior art. However, because the limitations of base claims 1 and 22 are sufficient to distinguish Reiman, a discussion regarding the dependent claims is unnecessary.

Rejection Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 30, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Reiman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,209 (Budhraj et al.). Claims 9-18 and 30-39 were canceled. While claims 3-6, 8, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 40, and 41 each recite further limitations that render these separately patentable over the prior art, a discussion is not necessary because the limitations of base claims 1 and 22 are sufficient to distinguish Reiman in view of Budhraj.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. Included with this response is the transmittal authorizing any necessary fees.



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100